



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,976	05/16/2005	Soichiro Watanabe	272239US0PCT	1724

22850 7590 03/20/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

MERCIER, MELISSA S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com

oblonpat@oblon.com

jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/534,976

Applicant(s)

WATANABE, SOICHIRO

Examiner

MELISSA S. MERCIER

Art Unit

1615

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14, 16 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-14, 16 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. Claims 1-3, 5-14 and 16-17 are pending in this application. Claims 4 and 15 have been cancelled. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous Office Actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 5, 11-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano et al. (US Patent 6,299,887) in view of Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344).

Yano discloses a cosmetic peel off type pack composition comprising 10% polyvinyl alcohol, kaolin (water swelling clay mineral) and sodium alginate (a water soluble thickener), purified water, and titanium dioxide (a cosmetic pigment). The film forming agents, (i.e. polyvinyl alcohol) as added to the aqueous phase and mixed (Example 13, column 21).

Yano further discloses additional components including oils, surfactants, humectants, UV-shielding agents, preservatives, thickeners, colorants, and medicinal components, including vitamins and antibacterial agents (column 8, lines 13-29).

Yano does not disclose titanium-titanium dioxide sinter as a dye.

Shiraishi discloses a temporary hair dye containing titanium black and other pigments (abstract). Titanium-titanium dioxide sintered substance is disclosed as titanium black (column 2, lines 9-10). Regarding the specific conditions of preparation of the sinter, it is the examiners position that Shiraishi discloses the use of Tilack D, which applicant's specification on page 6, top paragraph, recites as an acceptable sinter, so it would therefore meet the specific limitations of the instant claims.

Regarding the specific limitations of claims 12-14 and 16, the claim is drawn to a process of preparing the titanium-titanium dioxide sinter, thereby considered a product by process limitation, since the claims are drawn to the product, the method by which the product is obtained does not hold patentable weight. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have optimized the particle size of the dye in order to optimize the coloring and to negate any kind of gritty feeling commonly associated with larger particles.

While the Shiraishi reference discloses a hair dye composition, it is noted by the examiner that the instant application discloses the use of titanium-titanium dioxide sinter is "to increase the covering effect of the cosmetic pack preparation, to make it easy to identify the applied areas and peeled areas and the cleaning effect, to increase the drying speed and film strength, thereby rendering the film easy to be peeled off". (page

Art Unit: 1615

5, 2nd paragraph). Additionally, it is noted Applicant states "any titanium-titanium dioxide sinter commonly used in cosmetic composition can be used without specific limitations". Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have substituted the titanium-titanium dioxide sinter of Shiraishi with the titanium dioxide pigment of Yano in order to obtain a cosmetic composition with a dark coloring and that has a weak pigment base and therefore, will not stain the skin (column 1, lines 43-54).

The instant claims differ from the references only in the specific percentage selected for the compositions. However, It would have been deemed *prima Facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize the percentage of dye coloring, to prepare a composition for topical application because the determination of a specific percentage having the optimum therapeutic effect is well within the level of one having ordinary skill in the art, and the artisan would be motivated to determine optimum amounts to get the maximum effect of the active compounds. Therefore, the invention as Whole has been *prima face* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano et al. (US Patent 6,299,887) and Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344) in view of Mochizuki et al. (US Patent 6,602,513).

The combined teachings of Yano and Shiraishi are disclosed above and applied in the same manner.

Yano and Shiraishi do not disclose the use of an anionic surfactant; in particular phosphate, sulfonate, or sulfate based anionic surfactants.

Mochizuki discloses pack compositions comprising anionic surfactants including higher fatty acid amide sulfonates including sodium N-myristoyl-N-methyltaurate, sodium methyltaurate cocoate and sodium laurylmethyltaurid, phosphoric ester salts including sodium POE oleyl ether phosphate and POE stearyl ether phosphoric acid, sulfosuccinates, alkylbenzenesulfonates, higher fatty acid ester sulfates including sodium hydrogenated glyceryl cocoate sulfate, sulfated oils, alpha.-olefinsulfonates, higher fatty acid ester sulfonate, sec-alcohol sulfate, higher fatty acid alkyloyl amide sulfate, for example (column 4, line 44 through column 5, line 5).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the anionic surfactants disclosed by Mochizuki in the pack composition disclosed by Yano and Shiraishi since Yano discloses the generic teaching of the additon of a surfactant and Mochizuki discloses the same type of peel off cosmetic pack with specific surfactants disclosed. It would be within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill to have used an anionic surfactant for the well known functional property known in the art and used for cosmetic peel compositions.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano et al. (US Patent 6,299,887) and Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344) in view of Kaneda et al. (US Patent 6,596,285).

The combined teachings of Yano and Shiraishi are disclosed above and applied in the same manner.

Yano and Shiraishi do not disclose the use of ascorbic acid derivatives and/or water-soluble glycyrrhizic acid derivatives. The use of two different PVA's is also not disclosed.

Kaneda discloses an emulsified fast drying peel-off type cosmetic pack comprising antioxidants (column 4, line 37).

Regarding claims 6-7, it is additionally disclosed polyvinyl alcohols are divided into several grades based on differences in the degree of polymerization and the degree of saponification. The degree of polymerization is usually indicated by the viscosity measurement of a 4%-concentration aqueous solution at 20C. For the present invention, those with a low viscosity of 4 cps to a high viscosity of 70 cps can be used. However, the formed film tends to become stronger and the viscosity of the pack increases as the degree of polymerization becomes higher. Therefore, considering the adequate strength of the film and the viscosity which makes pack application easy. On the other hand, the degree of saponification is defined based on different saponification ratios of the acetyl groups in polyvinyl acetate when manufacturing polyvinyl alcohols, which is largely divided into the complete saponification type which is saponified almost completely (98-100%), and "the partial saponification type", which is partially saponified (87-89%) with some remaining acetyl groups. Although both saponification types can be used, the partial saponification type has a higher solubility at room temperature, better viscosity stability at lower temperatures, and a superior ability to emulsify the blended

oil, and therefore it is preferable to use the partial saponification type polyvinyl alcohol. The blend ratio of the aforementioned polyvinyl alcohol is preferably 5-20 wt %, more preferably 9-15 wt %, of the total amount of the pack cosmetic. If the blend ratio is less than 5 wt %, then a film with adequate strength will not form and even peeling will be difficult. On the other hand, if the blend ratio is more than 20 wt %, then the viscosity will be too high and application may not be easy (column 2, lines 20-52).

Regarding claim 8, Ascorbic acid is disclosed in Examples 29-30 (column 8).

Regarding claim 9, POE-glycerol fatty acid esters including POE-glycerol monostearate, POE-glycerol monoisostearate and POE-glycerol triisostearate are disclosed (column 3, line 40 through column 4, line 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the antioxidants disclosed by Kaneda in the composition disclosed by Yano and Shiraishi since Kaneda discloses the same type of peel-off composition taught by Yano and both references teach the use of antioxidants and the use of different types of PVA. Ascorbic acid is a well-known antioxidant used in cosmetic compositions.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yano et al. (US Patent 6,299,887) and Shiraishi et al. (US Patent 5,733,344) in view of Kern (US Patent 4,717,737).

The combined teachings of Yano and Shiraishi are disclosed above and applied in the same manner.

Yano and Shiraishi do not disclose the use of dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate.

Kern discloses an antibacterial composition in the form of a lotion, cream, and ointment, for example (column 1, lines 5-13). The composition comprises dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate, as an antibacterial agent.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the antibacterial agent dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate in the composition of Yano and Shiraishi. Since Yano discloses the use of antibacterial agents in his peel-off type cosmetic pack. It would have been within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the particular antibacterial component for its functional properties.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed. Due to the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action, this action is Non-Final. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA S. MERCIER whose telephone number is (571)272-9039. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-4pm Mon through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward can be reached on (571) 272-8373. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1615

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Melissa S Mercier/
Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/Michael P Woodward/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1615